



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/664,969	09/16/2000	Robert Antonacci	865-002u	4464
7590	06/08/2004		EXAMINER	
SOFER & HAROUN L.L.P. 317 MADISON AVENUE SUITE 910 NEW YORK, NY 10017			JONES, DAVID	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2622	
			DATE MAILED: 06/08/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/664,969

Applicant(s)

ANTONACCI ET AL.

Examiner

David L Jones

Art Unit

2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 May 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-50 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-50 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All
  - b) Some \*
  - c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. The amendment filed on 3/29/2004 has been entered and made of record. Claims 1-50 are pending.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments, see page 18, filed 3/29/2004, with respect to the drawings have been fully considered and are persuasive. The objections of drawings have been withdrawn.
3. Applicant's arguments, see page 18, filed 3/29/2004, with respect to specification have been fully considered and are persuasive. The objections of specification have been withdrawn.
4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-50 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

With respect to applicant's argument that the prior art is not analogous to the claimed invention, it is the office position that the art is analogous. With respect to the 35 USC 102 rejections, a non-analogous argument is not germane to a rejection under section 102 (MPEP 2131.05). Further, non-analogous under 35 USC 103, the prior art is considered analogous under the basis that they are all found to be utilizing a barcode with a patient record or sending a fax document to a central filing area, all are dealing with a patient record in one fashion or another.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., patient medical record) are not recited in the rejected claim(s) 1, 17, 21, and 37.

Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
6. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogawa et al. (US 5,608,874) and further in view of Lake et al. (GB 2,244,625A).

**Regarding claim 1**, Ogawa et al. teaches (column 27, lines 57-67 and column 28, lines 1-67) a system comprising:  
a facsimile device (fig. 10, #54J, column 27, lines 57-65) configured to transmit facsimile image of an original document and separate facsimile form;  
an interactive user device (#52);  
a processor (#20) coupled to said interactive user device via Internet (column 11, lines 51-60) and to said facsimile device via a public-switched telephone network, wherein said processor is further configured to receive from said facsimile device a transmission of said facsimile image of said original document and separate facsimile form, and to provide to an

Art Unit: 2622

authorized user of said interactive user device upon request said information material (column 27, lines 25-56).

Ogawa teaches that the forms processing software identifies the type of document represented by means such as reading identifying information on a cover page, which precedes the transmission of the actual data, such as account number, name or a specific form layout. Although, Ogawa does not explicitly teach utilizing a barcode on the cover sheet, Lake et al. teaches utilizing a simple sheet of barcodes and putting one on a cover sheet (page 5, lines 1-6) before being faxed, to associate a document with the barcode (page 6, lines 1-3) or the computer system can also be arranged to generate documents for facsimile transmission complete with a barcode (page 8, lines 23-26).

Ogawa et al. and Lake et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor that is both are dealing with sending facsimile documents.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine ability of Lake et al. to add a barcode to a coversheet with the coversheet of Ogawa et al.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide further security means to a document, so that no mix up within the system can occur.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ogawa et al. with Lake et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

**Regarding claims 2,** Ogawa teaches (column 8, lines 55-60) that the original material can be medical information.

**Regarding claims 3,** Ogawa teaches that the forms processing software identifies the

type of document represented by means such as reading identifying information on a cover page, which precedes the transmission of the actual data, such as account number, name or a specific form layout. Although, Ogawa does not explicitly teach utilizing a barcode on the cover sheet, Lake et al. teaches utilizing a simple sheet of barcodes and putting one on a cover sheet (page 5, lines 1-6) before being faxed, to associate a document with the barcode (page 6, lines 1-3) or the computer system can also be arranged to generate documents for facsimile transmission complete with a barcode (page 8, lines 23-26).

Regarding claim 4, Ogawa and Lake teach a facsimile document system. Ogawa teaches as described in claim 1, that the system includes a coversheet with at least account information and name of individual. But does not explicitly detail that the coversheet includes a barcode.

Whereas, Lake et al. discloses a fax coversheet with barcoded material on a fax coversheet to be sent to a specified recipient (page 5, lines 1-6).

Regarding claim 5, Ogawa and Lake teach a facsimile document system. Ogawa teaches as described in claim 1, that the system includes a coversheet with at least account information and name of individual. But does not explicitly detail that the coversheet includes a barcode.

Whereas, Lake et al. discloses a fax coversheet with barcoded material on a fax coversheet to be sent to a specified recipient (page 5, lines 1-6). Further, Lake discloses that the computer system can also be arranged to generate documents for facsimile transmission complete with a barcode (page 8, lines 23-26).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that to be able to print the barcode the system must have a barcode generator.

7. Claims 6-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogawa and Lake as applied to claims 1-5 above, and further in view of Feinberg (US 6,082,776).

Regarding claim 6, Ogawa and Lake et al. disclose a facsimile system, however, Ogawa and Lake et al. do not disclose a barcode reader. Lake discloses (page 8, lines 10-21) that there is a computer system connected to the facsimile machine, which has a set of programs that provide the facility for reading the coded document.

Whereas, Feinberg, discloses a translator program that changes the barcoded information back into a human readable format (column 7, lines 15-19).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the translator program of Feinberg, with Lake to read the incoming barcoded document, and both incorporated within the system of Ogawa.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that to be able to read an incoming document that has a barcode to include the disclosed translator program.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Ogawa, Lake and Feinberg to obtain the invention as specified in claim 6.

Regarding claim 7, Ogawa teaches (column 28, lines 39-53) that the system includes an account number associated with each account. Although, Ogawa does not explicitly teach utilizing a barcode on the cover sheet, Lake et al. teaches utilizing a simple sheet of barcodes and putting one on a cover sheet (page 5, lines 1-6) before being faxed, to associate a document with

Art Unit: 2622

the barcode (page 6, lines 1-3) or the computer system can also be arranged to generate documents for facsimile transmission complete with a barcode (page 8, lines 23-26). Feinberg teaches the use of an identification number (fig. 4) associated with a particular patient (see ID at top of form).

**Regarding claim 8,** Ogawa teaches (column 13, lines 33-38) that the system includes security features such as requiring a valid login to include a login name and password. Lake et al. teaches that a printed coding is unique identification of the intended recipient, neither explicitly discloses authentication data that corresponds to a particular patient. Whereas, Feinberg teaches that it will provide password protection access for privacy and confidentiality (column 6, lines 38-42), and therefore it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made that part of the authentication process shall include the unique identification number from figure 4 of Feinberg.

**Regarding claim 9,** Ogawa teaches that the system stores the incoming information in a specific location within the system related to a particular account (column 18, lines 11-27). Lake et al. (page 7, lines 23-25) and Feinberg (column 7, lines 1-14) teach a storage means for storing said information materials, wherein said processor is further configured to store said information materials in a storage location corresponding to said coded information material.

**Regarding claim 10,** Ogawa teaches (column 13, lines 33-38) that the system includes security features such as requiring a valid login to include a login name and password. Lake et al. teaches that a printed coding is unique identification of the intended recipient, neither explicitly discloses authentication data that corresponds to a particular patient. Whereas, Feinberg teaches that it will provide password protection access for privacy and confidentiality (column 6, lines

38-42), and therefore it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made that part of the authentication process shall include the unique identification number from figure 4 of Feinberg with each patient identification.

Claims 11-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogawa et al., Lake et al. and Feinberg as applied to claims 1-9 above, and further in view of Kara (US 6,0886,095).

Regarding claim 11, Ogawa, Lake and Feinberg teach a system of sending a facsimile document and encoding the same. Ogawa teaches that the information system includes safeguards (column 11, lines 2-16 and lines 61-67), including data encryption and security techniques. However, Lake and Feinberg do not explicitly disclose the ability to encrypt the information. Whereas, Kara discloses that the coded information can be further encrypted in addition to being coded (column 4, lines 60-62).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the ability to encrypt a barcode document with Ogawa, Lake and Feinberg.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide additional security as taught by Kara.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Ogawa, Lake, Feinberg and Kara to obtain the invention as specified in claim 11.

**Regarding claims 12 and 15.** Ogawa teaches that the information system includes safeguards (column 11, lines 2-16 and lines 61-67), including data encryption and security techniques. Kara (column 4, lines 60-62), Lake et al. (page 8, lines 10-14) discloses that the material may further be encrypted after being coded, and then stored, but does not explicitly disclose an encryption information data module; Feinberg does not disclose the ability to encrypt the information. Whereas, Schoenberg discloses many levels of security is possible, (column 5, lines 10-18) through software that encrypts or decrypts as required (column 4, lines 39-42). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made that to allow for encryption or decryption it is implied that there is an encryption information data module.

**Regarding claims 13.** Ogawa teaches that the information system includes safeguards (column 11, lines 2-16 and lines 61-67), including data encryption and security techniques. Kara teaches that the material may further be encrypted after being coded, and then stored (column 4, lines 60-62), Lake et al. teaches that the information may be encrypted and stored upon incoming; Feinberg does not disclose an encryption process. Kara and Lake et al. do not explicitly detail that the storage corresponding to the identification number. Whereas, Schoenberg discloses implicitly that the material has many levels of security (column 5, lines 10-18) corresponding to the particular patient and their identification, therefore it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made that the encrypted information is stored with respect to the identification of the patient according to the Schoenberg teachings.

**Regarding claim 14.** Ogawa teaches (column 13, lines 33-38) that the system includes security features such as requiring a valid login to include a login name and password. Kara teaches that a user may interface with a computer system thereby browsing the patient's emergency information (column 5, lines 34-40), Lake et al. teaches the use of a password to interface the information (column 8, lines 10-14), Feinberg teaches password protection (column 6, lines 38-42). Whereas, Schoenberg teaches the use of many levels of security including a double password system as is shown in the table on bottom of column 6.

**Regarding claim 16.** Ogawa teaches (column 13, lines 33-38) that the system includes security features such as requiring a valid login to include a login name and password. Kara discloses that all material can be encrypted for additional security (column 4, lines 60-62), but does not explicitly disclose the ability to decrypt the information. Whereas, Lake et al. discloses the ability to identify the facsimile transmission as confidential and automatically encrypt the information and later decrypt the information; further, it allows the document to be viewed on a visual display unit by an authorized recipient. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to allow for the feature disclosed by Lake et al. in the system disclosed by Ogawa, thereby allowing for viewing only by an authorized recipient.

8. Claims 17-25 and 37-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kara and further in view of Lake and Ogawa.

**Regarding claim 17.** Kara discloses a system (fig. 1, #10) comprising:

a processor (#120) comprising: means for receiving a facsimile from a facsimile device (#124); means for receiving a telephone call from a telephone, wherein said processor is coupled to said facsimile device and to said telephone (#125) via a public-switched telephone network (#172), wherein said processor is configured to receive from said facsimile device a transmission of a code associated information material (#100C), and, upon a request received via said telephone, to transmit said code-associated information material to a user designated facsimile device (column 5, lines 58-67; column 6, lines 1-15). However, Kara does not explicitly teach a coversheet for the original document.

Ogawa teaches that the forms processing software identifies the type of document represented by means such as reading identifying information on a cover page, which precedes the transmission of the actual data, such as account number, name or a specific form layout. Although, Ogawa does not explicitly teach utilizing a barcode on the cover sheet, Lake et al. teaches utilizing a simple sheet of barcodes and putting one on a cover sheet (page 5, lines 1-6) before being faxed, to associate a document with the barcode (page 6, lines 1-3) or the computer system can also be arranged to generate documents for facsimile transmission complete with a barcode (page 8, lines 23-26).

Kara, Ogawa et al. and Lake et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor that is both are dealing with sending facsimile documents.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine ability of Lake et al. to add a barcode to a coversheet, with the coversheet of Ogawa et al and to the system of Kara.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide further security means to a document, so that no mix up within the system can occur.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ogawa et al. and Lake et al. with Kara to obtain the invention as specified in claim 17.

Regarding claim 21, Kara discloses a method comprising the steps of: associating a code with an information material (fig. 1, #100B); transmitting with a facsimile device (#120) said code-associated information material to a processor via a public-switched telephone network (#170); receiving at said processor (#130) said transmission of said code-associated information materials, and providing said information material to an authorized user via Internet at said interactive user device in response to a request received therefrom (column 8, lines 26-31).

However, Kara does not explicitly teach a coversheet for the original document.

Ogawa teaches that the forms processing software identifies the type of document represented by means such as reading identifying information on a cover page, which precedes the transmission of the actual data, such as account number, name or a specific form layout. Although, Ogawa does not explicitly teach utilizing a barcode on the cover sheet, Lake et al. teaches utilizing a simple sheet of barcodes and putting one on a cover sheet (page 5, lines 1-6) before being faxed, to associate a document with the barcode (page 6, lines 1-3) or the computer system can also be arranged to generate documents for facsimile transmission complete with a barcode (page 8, lines 23-26).

Kara, Ogawa et al. and Lake et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor that is both are dealing with sending facsimile documents.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine ability of Lake et al. to add a barcode to a coversheet, with the coversheet of Ogawa et al and to the system of Kara.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide further security means to a document, so that no mix up within the system can occur.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ogawa et al. and Lake et al. with Kara to obtain the invention as specified in claim 21.

Regarding claim 37, Kara discloses a method comprising the steps of: associating a code with an information material (fig. 1, #100B); transmitting via a facsimile device (#120) said code-associated information material to a processor via a public-switched telephone network (#170); receiving at said processor said transmission of said code-associated information materials, and providing said code-associated information material to an authorized user at a user designated facsimile device at in response to a request received via telephone (column 5, lines 58-67; column 6, lines 1-15). However, Kara does not explicitly teach a coversheet for the original document that includes a barcode.

Ogawa teaches that the forms processing software identifies the type of document represented by means such as reading identifying information on a cover page, which precedes the transmission of the actual data, such as account number, name or a specific form layout. Although, Ogawa does not explicitly teach utilizing a barcode on the cover sheet, Lake et al. teaches utilizing a simple sheet of barcodes and putting one on a cover sheet (page 5, lines 1-6) before being faxed, to associate a document with the barcode (page 6, lines 1-3) or the computer

system can also be arranged to generate documents for facsimile transmission complete with a barcode (page 8, lines 23-26).

Kara, Ogawa et al. and Lake et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor that is both are dealing with sending facsimile documents.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine ability of Lake et al. to add a barcode to a coversheet, with the coversheet of Ogawa et al and to the system of Kara.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide further security means to a document, so that no mix up within the system can occur.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ogawa et al. and Lake et al. with Kara to obtain the invention as specified in claim 37.

Regarding claims 18, 22, and 38 are analogous to rejection for claim 2.

Regarding claims 19, 23, and 39 are analogous to rejection for claim 3.

Regarding claims 24 and 40 are analogous to rejection for claim 4.

Regarding claims 20 and 25 are analogous to rejection for claim 5.

9. Claims 26-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kara, Ogawa and Lake as applied to claims 17-25 and 37-40 above, and further in view of Feinberg (US 6,082,776).

Regarding claim 26, Kara, Ogawa and Lake et al. disclose a facsimile system, however,

Art Unit: 2622

Kara, Ogawa and Lake do not disclose a barcode reader. Lake discloses (page 8, lines 10-21) that there is a computer system connected to the facsimile machine, which has a set of programs that provide the facility for reading the coded document.

Whereas, Feinberg, discloses a translator program that changes the barcoded information back into a human readable format (column 7, lines 15-19).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the translator program of Feinberg, with Ogawa and Lake to read the incoming barcoded document, and both incorporated within the system of Kara.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that to be able to read an incoming document that has a barcode to include the disclosed translator program.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Kara, Ogawa, Lake and Feinberg to obtain the invention as specified in claim 26.

Regarding claim 27 is analogous to rejection for claim 7

Regarding claim 28 is analogous to rejection for claim 8.

Regarding claim 29 is analogous to rejection for claim 9.

Regarding claim 30 is analogous to rejection for claim 10.

Regarding claim 31 is analogous to rejection for claim 11.

Regarding claims 32 and 35 are analogous to rejections for claims 12 and 15.

Regarding claim 33 is analogous to rejection for claim 13.

Regarding claim 34 is analogous to rejection for claim 14.

Regarding claim 36 is analogous to rejection for claim 16.

Regarding claim 41, Kara teaches a process that allows for interaction with a medical record via the internet (column 8, lines 26-31), a process whereby a facsimile document is used for registering patients in a system (column 4, lines 63-67; column 5, lines 1-5) wherein medical records are faxed via a public-switched telephone network to a processor and are accessible for display to users authorized by said patient, said transmission paper comprising: a barcode configured to be appended to a patient's medical record for fax transmission to said system; patient access information which enables said user authorized by said patient to access and display said medical record via Internet (column 8, lines 26-31). However, Kara does not explicitly teach a coversheet for the original document.

Ogawa teaches that the forms processing software identifies the type of document represented by means such as reading identifying information on a cover page, which precedes the transmission of the actual data, such as account number, name or a specific form layout. Although, Ogawa does not explicitly teach utilizing a barcode on the cover sheet, Lake et al. teaches utilizing a simple sheet of barcodes and putting one on a cover sheet (page 5, lines 1-6) before being faxed, to associate a document with the barcode (page 6, lines 1-3) or the computer system can also be arranged to generate documents for facsimile transmission complete with a barcode (page 8, lines 23-26).

Kara, Ogawa et al. and Lake et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor that is both are dealing with sending facsimile documents.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine ability of Lake et al. to add a barcode to a coversheet, with the coversheet of Ogawa et al and to the system of Kara.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide further security means to a document, so that no mix up within the system can occur.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ogawa et al. and Lake et al. with Kara to obtain the invention as specified in claim 41.

**Regarding claim 42.** Kara, Lake et al. and Feinberg do not disclose the ability to include payment information within their systems. Ogawa teaches (column 19, lines 7-13) that the system maintains records for billing purposes. Schoenberg allows payment information of said patient to be included within a designated field selected by the patient during the generate hierarchical categories step 204, figure 2.

**Regarding claim 43.** Ogawa, Kara, Lake et al. and Feinberg do not disclose the ability to remove any patient information within their systems. Whereas, Schoenberg during the generate hierarchical categories of figure 2, step 204, that when the patient is allowed to change fields.

**Regarding claim 44.** Ogawa teaches (column 28, lines 38-53) that the forms processing software identifies the type of document represented by means such as reading identifying information on a cover page, which precedes the transmission of the actual data, such as account number, name or a specific form layout. Kara, Lake et al., Feinberg (column 6, lines 38-42) and Schoenberg (column 6, lines 26-30) disclose the ability to include an identification number or name, a password and an access code.

**Regarding claim 45.** Ogawa does not teach the ability for a particular doctor to input information. Kara and Feinberg teach the ability of the doctor or medical professional to access the patient information, but do not explicitly disclose that the doctor must input any special access information. Lake et al. discloses a barcode facsimile system, but does not disclose any

medical information. Whereas, Schoenberg (column 4, lines 8-10) teaches the ability to have doctor access information comprising an identification number, or name and an access code.

**Regarding claim 46,** Ogawa does not teach the ability for a particular doctor to input information. Kara, and Feinberg, teach the ability of the doctor or medical professional to access the patient information, but do not explicitly disclose that the doctor must input any special access information. Lake et al. discloses a barcode facsimile system, but does not disclose any medical information. Whereas, Schoenberg teaches the ability, wherein, said medical records are accessible to said doctor upon said doctor entering said access code (column 4, lines 8-10).

**Regarding claim 47,** Ogawa teaches that the system includes a user having to input a user name and password, but does not explicitly dictate that the user is a patient. Kara allows for added security, but does not disclose the ability to have the patient access include a password. Lake et al., Feinberg, and Schoenberg disclose said patient access information further comprises a password.

**Regarding claim 48,** Ogawa, Kara, Lake et al. and Feinberg do not disclose the ability to remove any patient information within their systems, whereas, Schoenberg during the generate hierarchical categories of figure 2, step 204, that when the patient is allowed to change fields, and to do so must include access information including a password (column 6, lines 26-47).

**Regarding claim 49,** Ogawa, Kara, Lake et al., and Feinberg, do not explicitly disclose the ability to have any access information to be hidden so that cannot be changed except by patient. Whereas, Schoenberg teaches that only the patient may change or access the user identification, user name and/ password (column 5, lines 27-33).

Regarding claim 50, Ogawa and Kara, disclose a system that allows for security encryption. Ogawa includes a fax coversheet but does not explicitly detail a scratch-off area. Kara does not specify the use of a fax coversheet or the ability to remove the information in any fashion from the same. Whereas, Lake et al. discloses a fax coversheet with coded information, which allows for barcoded information to be in the form of a peel-off sheet or label (column 8, lines 23-26). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the inventions was made to include label of Lake et al. in the system disclosed by Kara and Ogawa thereby allowing a fax coversheet with an added security feature, which can be scratched off or removed from the facsimile sheet if required.

### *Conclusion*

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Ross, Jr. et al. U.S. Patent 5,823,948 the system allows for automatic incorporation of dictionary text, medical record text, prephrased text, etc.

Serinken U.S. Patent 5,905,801 a method is provided for transmitting and/or receiving files via a facsimile machine or computer fax modem.

Reber et al. U.S. Patent 5,969,324 an accounting system that includes a point of sale terminal to print a transaction receipt having a non-predictable barcode and human-readable transaction information based upon the transaction data.

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

***Contact Information***


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David L Jones whose telephone number is (703) 305-4675. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (7:00am - 3:30pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Coles can be reached on (703) 305-4712. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

David L. Jones



  
EDWARD COLES  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600